10/27/70

Dick (Howard, Gary),

I've checked the two citations in "The Spies", pp. 186 and 193 and rea them a bit different than you seem to. They are very interesting, but only if questioned.

The reprints are not credited to any earlier publication, which makes me wonder, since it is an anthology. Nor does the book have a hardback history.

Pearson and Anderson are often used for the planting of stories. Sometimes each was favored by part of a department, each seeming to fight the other. They have become dependant upon leaks, to a degree, for a daily column consumes an enormous amount of information. I think the CIA used them in this case.

186 says there was an enormous missle of which the CIA, desparately, wanted a picture. Its suspected intended use in a May Day spectacular is irrelevant to anyx risky espionage, any military use.The picture could have awaited the summit, assuming all of the claim to be true. If, indeed, a satellite didn't or couldn't get it. Having a picture would neither prevent nor diminish the effect of such an alleged (by the spooks?) plan. Or, this is gibberish, but a cover for the CIA, another effort to give its miserable business a clean face, a semblance of legitimate national purpose.

193 says the last penetration before the Powers mission was April 9, when this missle base was overflown and the plane got important pix. Then what was the need for the politically-dangerous Powers one? This page also says what has to be false, that a U-2 "got within 70 miles of Moscow" , this "without detection". Rubbish. With the successful one of 4/9 "picked up by the frustrated Russians" (assume this to be true, for it must have been, whether or not "frustrated"), what do the wily Americans do? Send Powers to the place they have already photographed, where there is a waiting reception. And on May Day, yet!

The lilies are gilded. Word "leaked out" that the Russians were "aware of the full extent of U-2 espionage", so they had to move missle sites (not to be seen by satellite cameras?), even using trains (we didn't?) for bases. Then pathos: how will we keep track of this movement, with the U-2s grounded? The answer didn't become apparent to us for a while, but the Russians knew about and had their own satellite cameras....The spooks were not very imaginative...And up tight, too....With Andrew St. George as an "expert", on "How th CIA Got Che" (cover blurb: They had Che Guevara in their sights all along and brought him down when they thought the time was ripe), how much more authoritative can a source be? Which makes me ever happier to have it...The pot boil from Fawcett magazines, going back to 1949...Thanks, HW